



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,649	02/27/2002	William W. Stead	VUMC001/00US	1797
22903	7590	10/25/2006	EXAMINER	
COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP			COBANOGLU, DILEK B	
ATTN: PATENT GROUP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
THE BOWEN BUILDING				
875 15TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 800			3626	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-2221			DATE MAILED: 10/25/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/083,649	STEAD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dilek B. Cobanoglu	3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on 08/04/2006.

Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eglinton (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0091687 A1) in view of Bennett et al. (hereinafter Bennett) (U. S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0161606 A1).

A. Claim 1 has been amended now to recite “generating an order for the clinical action based on input from the clinician with respect to the practice information and that complies with all billing requirements of a payor.”

Eglinton fails to expressly teach the billing requirements of a payor, per se, since it appears that Eglinton is more directed to generating an order for the clinical action based on input from the clinician with respect to the practice information. However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Bennett.

In particular, Bennett discloses generating an order for the clinical action based on input from the clinician with respect to the practice information

and that complies with all billing requirements of a payor (Bennett; abstract, paragraphs. 0007, 0025, 0029, 0045, 0066, 0128, Figures: 6, 7, 9A).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Bennett with the motivation of checking the eligibility of the patient for the payment.

The rest of the claim is rejected with the same reasons provided in the previous office action mailed on 04/05/2006 (paper number 2-3).

B. The amendment to system claim 8 and an article of manufacture claim 14 reflect the same changes made to method claim 1, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for method claim 1 in addition to the reasons given in the prior Office Action (paper number 4-5).

C. Claims 3-7, 10-13 and 16-20 have not been amended, and Applicant does not appear to argue the separate patentability of these claims. As such, claims 3-7, 10-13 and 16-20 are rejected for the same reasons given in the previous Office Action (paper number 3-6), and incorporated herein.

4. Claims 2, 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eglinton (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0091687 A1) and Bennett et al. (hereinafter Bennett) (U. S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0161606 A1) further in view of Mitchell et al. (hereinafter Mitchell) (U.S. Patent No. 6,684,188 B1).

A. Claims 2, 9 and 15 have not been amended, and Applicant does not appear to argue the separate patentability of these claims. As such, claims 2, 9 and 15 are rejected for the same reasons given in the previous Office Action (paper number 6-8), and incorporated herein.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

7. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dilek B. Cobanoglu whose telephone number is 571-272-8295. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DBC
DBC
Art Unit 3626
10/05/2006


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER